



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXXVIII, I.

WHOLE No. 149.

## I.—SOME CRUCES IN VEDIC TEXT, GRAMMAR, AND INTERPRETATION.

### 1. *ajuryamur* for *ajur(yām) yamur*, and other haplogies.

RV. 5. 6. 10 we have the notorious passage containing the complex of syllables, *ajuryamur*, which the *Padakāra* fails to analyze, to wit:

evāñ agnīm *ajuryamur* gīrbhīr yajñébhir ānuṣák,  
dádhad asmé suvīryam utá tyád āçvāçvyam.

For previous discussions of *ajuryamur* by Ludwig, Pischel, Bartholomae, and Oldenberg, see the last-mentioned scholar's *Rig-Veda Noten*, First Part, p. 315 ff. My own way is indicated by the heading.

If we regard *ajuryamur* as haplological contraction for *ajur(yām) yamur*, the first distich is to be rendered: 'Thus they have gotten hold of imperishable Agni by means of songs and sacrifices, properly'. Agni, like other gods, is imperishable, *ajuryá*, RV. I. 146. 4; 2. 8. 2; 10. 88. 13; *ajāra* I. 58. 4; 127. 9; 6. 29, etc. For 'holding', 'keeping hold' of Agni see 3. 27. 3, *agne çakéma te vayām yāmañ devāsya vājīnaḥ*; or 2. 5. 1, *çakéma vājīno yāmam*.

Another case of haplogy as between two individual words, namely *tavāsañ rabhasva* for *tavāsañ(sām)rabhasva* occurs in AV. II. 1. 14:

émá agur yoṣītaḥ çumbhamānā út tiṣṭha nāri tavāsañ  
rabhasva,

supātnī pātyā prajāyā prajāvaty á tvāgan yajñāḥ práti  
kumbhām gṛbhāya.

A glance at the lists under root *rabh* in Grassmann's and Whitney's Indexes to RV. and AV. shows that the simple root without prepositional prefixes scarcely occurs in either text. Whitney, indeed, lists the simple root only in that very passage, AV. 11. 1. 14. In a note on p. 614 of my translation of the hymn, SBE. xlii, I stated that *Sāyaṇa* reads in *pāda* b, *tava saṁrabhasva*, and the *Pāippalāda*, *tavaḥ saṁrabhasva*. I remarked, furthermore, that the original reading may have been, *tavāsam* (*sām*)*rabhasva*. Of this suggestion the Whitney-Lanman translation takes no note. Yet it furnishes the key to the passage: 'The maidens (the waters), ornamenting themselves, have come hither. Arise thou, woman, take hold of (*sām* *rabhasva*) the strong one (*tavāsam*, i. e., the pitcher, *kumbhām*, masculine) !'

Once more in a Vedic text, simple *rabh*, without preposition calls for correction. In MÇ. 3. 5. 13 we have the corrupt stanza, as edited by Knauer:

agnir bhagaḥ savitedaṁ juṣantāṁ prajāpatir varuṇo . . .  
ya . . . mahyam,  
yo no dveṣṭi tanūṁ rabhasvānāgasō yajamānasya vīrāḥ.

There are two parallels to this corrupt stanza. AV. 9. 5. 2:

indrāya bhāgāṁ pāri tvā nayāmy asmīn yajñe yajamānāya  
sūrīm,  
yé no dviṣānty ānu tān rabhasvānāgasō yajamānasya vīrāḥ.

And ApÇ. 7. 17. 2:

indrasya bhāgaḥ suvite dadhātanemaṁ yajñam yajamānaṁ  
ca sūrāu,  
yo no dveṣṭy anu taṁ ravasvānāgasō yajamānasya vīrāḥ.

Whitney, in his translation of AV., does not mention the parallels; Knauer, at MÇ., is cognizant of AV. 9. 5. 2, but not of ApÇ. The intricacies of these correspondences need not concern us at present. I would remark, however, that Knauer's mss. read at the beginning *agner bhāgaḥ*, which corresponds to the parallels, and is probably to be retained in the text. The point that concerns us here is that the third *pāda* of MÇ. is to be read *yo no dveṣṭy tam ānu rabhasva*. In ApÇ. *ravasva* is secondary, tho perhaps intentional; see the author, AJPh. XXVII. 413.

I note in this connection some cases of haplology in chance compounds. In RV. 1. 48. 2 the compound *viçvasuvíd*, by the side of *ácāvānt* and *gómant*, rendered by 'knowing all well', makes no sense in that connection (*Uṣas*). The word is *viç(va)-vasuvíd* 'getting all goods'; see *Uṣas*'s epithet *ābharád-vasu*, 'bringing on goods', 5. 79. 2; and cf. the word *vasutvanám* in the related stanza, 7. 81. 6, or the expression *utóṣo vásva iṇṣe* in 4. 52. 3. In *Ulūka-Jātaka* (270) *appatissavāsa*, 'living in anarchy', is for *a-ppatissa(va)vāsa*; and in *Dadhivāhana-Jātaka* (186) *maṇḍukaṇṭaka*, designation of a plant is probably for *maṇḍu(ka)-kaṇṭaka* 'frog-thorn'. In *Māhārāṣṭrī Prākṛit*, *avaratta* is for *ava(ra)ratta* = Skt. *apararātra*, 'second part of the night'; see Jacobi's *Ausgewählte Erzählungen*, p. 32, l. 37. On the literature of haplology (or haplolaly)<sup>1</sup>, which has of recent years grown apace, see last Collitz, *Das schwache Präteritum* (Göttingen, 1912), p. 237 ff. I would draw attention particularly to instances of the phenomenon as between two successive words: Bloomfield, *American Journal of Philology*, xvii. 418; Schwyzer, *IF*. xiv. 24 ff; xxviii. 300; and Wackernagel, *KZ*. xl. 546.

## 2. *chardís* for *chadís*, a case of contamination or word blend.

The two words in the caption are obviously related. The metre of the Veda points to *chadís* instead of *chardís* in all critical positions: RV. 1. 48. 15; 8. 9. 1; 18. 21; 27. 4; 67. 6; 71. 14. Grassmann (as after him others) outlines the problem very neatly in his *Lexicon*, s. v.: 'chardís, wofür wahrscheinlich überall *chadís* zu lesen ist, da sämtliche metrisch entscheidenden Stellen die Kürze der ersten Silbe fordern und keine deren Länge begünstigt. Das *r* scheint in die spätere Redaction durch Missverständniss hineingedrungen'. For other discussions see Oldenberg, *ZDMG*. lv. 312, and the literature there cited.

What now is the nature of this 'misunderstanding', and is it really such? Grassmann's statement is very well as soon as we substitute for misunderstanding the linguistic term 'contamination', or 'blend'. The poets of the RV. knew only

<sup>1</sup> In sense haplolaly is preferable to haplology, but the former word with its three l's ironically invites the very change which it aims to describe, as, indeed, also does haplology with its two *lo's*.

the word *chadís*, 'cover'. Like other words of this semantic class the word meant both 'cover' (in the physical sense), and 'protection'; cf., e. g., *várma*, 'armor', and, 'protection'. In the more concrete sense of 'cover' *chadís* occurs in RV. 10. 85. 10; AV. 3. 7. 3, and it endures down to Kathāsaritsāgara 2. 49. In the abstract sense of 'protection' the word blended with, or was contaminated by, *čárma* 'protection', taking its *r* from that word. Again in that form the word endures clear thru to Māhārāṣṭrī Prākṛit *chaḍḍi* (Jacobi, *Erzählungen*, p. 76, l. 32). The contamination obviously took place in the time that passed between RV. composition and RV. redaction. At the time of the redaction the word for 'protection' had so definitely assumed the form *chardís* that the diaskeuasts of the RV. had to substitute it for the poets' *chadís*, metre *contradi-cente*. The old word *chadís* had completely sloughed that meaning.

That all this is indeed so, is rendered probable by the intimate and persistent synonymy of *čárma* and *chardís*. Thus the line RV. 7. 52. 2<sup>b</sup>, *čárma tokāya tánayāya gopāḥ*, is echoed in the formula, *chardís tokāya tanayāya yacha*, TB. i. 1. 7. 1; ApÇ. 5. 12. 1. In RV. 1. 114. 5<sup>d</sup> both words occur together, *čárma várma chardír asmábhyaṁ yaṁsat*. Almost every qualifying expression that is used with *čárma* is also used with *chardís*. Thus *trivárūtha*, 'offering threefold safety', or *varūthyā*, 'offering safety'; or *várutha* by the side of each:

*čárma no yaṁsan trivárūtham*, 10. 66. 5  
*savitā čárma yachatv asmé trivárūtham*, 4. 53. 6  
*sá naḥ čárma trivárūtham ví yaṁsat*, 8. 42. 3  
*čármaṇā nas trivárūthena pāhi*, 5. 4. 8  
*trivárūtham maruto yanta naç chardíḥ*, 8. 18. 21.

Cf. also MS. 2. 8. 7<sup>d</sup>: III. 4; KS. 17. 6; TA. 2. 5. 2.

*čárma . . . varūthyām tād asmāsu ví yantana*, 8. 47. 10  
*bṛhaspátīḥ čárma . . . no yamad varūthyām*, 5. 46. 5  
*chardír yád vām varūthyām*, 6. 67. 2  
*bhāvā várūtham . . . maghávadbhyaḥ čárma*, 1. 58. 9  
*čárma no yantam ámavad várūtham*, 4. 55. 4  
*áčhidraṁ čárma yachata . . . várūtham*, 8. 27. 0  
*yád vaḥ . . . várūtham ásti yác chardíḥ*, 8. 67. 9.

Or, again, adjectives for 'broad' go with both nouns: *urú*, *prthú*, and especially *sapráthaḥ*:

*yáchā naḥ čárma sapráthaḥ*, 1. 22. 15

*sapráthaḥ čárma yacha saḥantya*, 6. 16. 33

*chardír yacha vītāhavyāya sapráthaḥ*, 6. 15. 3

*sapráthaḥ chardír yantam ádābhyam*, 8. 5. 12

*urv āsmā áditih čárma yaṁsat*, 4. 25. 5

*prá no yachatād avṛkām prthú chardih*, 1. 48. 15

*prāsmāi yachatam avṛkām prthú chardih*, 8. 9. 1.

As regards other adjectives, or other related connections, the following pairs or groups speak for themselves:

*durādhárṣam grṇaté čárma yaṁsat*, 6. 49. 7

*ádhrṣtam chardír yád vām*, 6. 67. 2

*bhāvā . . . maghavan maghávadbhyaḥ čárma*, 1. 58. 9

*chardír yacha maghávadbhyaḥ ca mahyam ca*, 6. 46. 9

(cf. 7. 74. 5; 8. 5. 12)

*čárma tokāya tánayāya gopāḥ*, 7. 52. 2 (cf. TB. 1. 1. 7. 1)

*ádhā smā yacha tanvè táne ca chardih*, 6. 42. 12.

On the character and frequency of lexical contaminations see the author, *Am. Journ. of Philol.* xii. 1 ff.; xvi. 1 ff.; *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, iv. 66 ff.; and most recently Güntert, *Ueber Reimwortbildungen im Arischen und Altgriechischen* (Heidelberg, 1914).

### 3. Some Σχήματα.

The two stanzas, RV. 1. 4 5, 6 read:

*utá bruvantu no nído nír anyatác cid ārata,*

*dádhnā indra íd dúvaḥ.*

*utá naḥ subhágān arír vocéyur dasma kṛṣṭāyaḥ,*

*syāméd indrasya čármaṇi.*

The renderings mark a to and fro from a correct understanding: Bollensen, *Orient und Occident*, ii. 462; Ludwig, 443; Grassmann, ii. 5; Pischel, *ZDMG.* xl. 125; Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii. 79; Oldenberg, *Rig-Veda Noten* i. 4. Geldner comes nearest to the correct sense; I would translate:

'Whether our enemies happen to say (about us): "when ye pay respect to Indra alone (íd), ye have shut yourself off

from other (benefits)"; or, if both gentle and common folk should, O wise (God Indra), pronounce us lucky, (in either case) shall we under Indra's protection be.' <sup>1</sup>

utá-utá are clearly antithetic. The two stanzas seem to express an almost sectarian difference between Indra worshipers and people who despise Indra (anindrá), but worship other gods. Intentionally I render aríḥ . . . kṛṣṭáyaḥ by 'both gentle and common folk', i. e., 'rich and poor', or 'patricians and plebeians'. Aríḥ has been suspected (Bollensen suggests aríḥ). But it is correct and idiomatic; we may call it participative singular. Johannes Schmidt, *Die Pluralbildungen der Indo-germanischen Neutra*, pp. 314 ff., following Roth's suggestion in *Pet. Lex.*, s. v. rathatúr, has shown that an inclusive plural noun with a plural verb is occasionally in Sanskrit and Greek accompanied by a singular noun which expresses part of the plural noun.<sup>2</sup> In our passage kṛṣṭáyaḥ includes both plebs (víçve, οἱ πολλοί) and patricians (arí); hence the participative singular aríḥ, by the side of and partly defining kṛṣṭáyaḥ with the plural verb. Cf. for this idiom also Ernst Fraenkel, *Indo-germanische Forschungen*, xxviii. 245 ff. For kṛṣṭí, arí, and víçva see Geldner, *Ved. Stud.* iii. 77 ff.

I am conceiving the matters involved here rather more precisely than does Geldner. kṛṣṭí (carṣaṇí), 'people' is the totality which includes arí and víçva, 'noble and common', its two natural subdivisions; see 7. 48. 3; 8. 1. 22; 51. 9; 65. 9; 10. 28. 1. In Geldner's rendering (p. 78) of víçvágūrto ariṣṭutáḥ in 8. 1. 22, 'der von allen Gerühmte, (sogar) von den Reichen Gepriesene', the word 'sogar' is needless. The expression means, 'he who is praised by plebs and "swell" alike'. Behind these two words stands the comprehensive kṛṣṭáyaḥ 'all folks'.

Another idiom, familiar in the Indo-European languages, ensures a similar effect, namely to mark the contrast between arí and víçva: RV. 10. 28. 1, víçvo hy anyó arír ājagāma māméd áha çvácuro nā jagāma. Geldner, p. 78, translates, 'Jeder andere, (sogar) der Reiche ist erschienen; nur mein Schwiegervater ist nicht erschienen'. This neither does jus-

<sup>1</sup> The last pāda is repeated secondarily in 8. 47. 5<sup>c</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> In Greek rhetoric this idiom is defined as σχῆμα καθ' ὅλον καὶ μέρος; Kühner, *Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, Satzlehre (Kühner-Gerth) vol. i, p. 289.

tice to the established contrast between *viçva* and *ari*, nor to the idiom involved in *anyá*. Translate: 'The common folk and (the others, sc.) the nobles have come, etc.'<sup>1</sup> This is the well-known anticipatory-appositional use of *anya*, common in Sanskrit, the exact replica of a familiar Greek idiom with *ἄλλο-*, e. g., Xen. Anab. i. 5. 5, *οὐ γὰρ ἦν χόρτος οὐδὲ ἄλλο δένδρον*. See Kühner, *Satzlehre*<sup>3</sup>, vol. i, p. 275, note 1; the author, *Amer. Journ. of Philology*, vii. 101; *Pet. Lex.* vol. i, p. 262<sup>b</sup>, where examples from Classical Sanskrit are cited abundantly but no Vedic cases. Another such case is contained in RV. i. 109. 6 where the word *anyá* in *viçvā bhúvanā . . . anyá* contrasts *viçvā bhúvanā*, 'all creatures', with a list of things that are not creatures. I suspect that other cases may turn up in the Veda.<sup>2</sup>

This idiom is familiar in modern French, in connection with plural pronouns; e. g., *nous autres Français*; *nous autres femmes*. It is also known in Spanish and other Romance tongues. Kühner-Gerth, l. c., also quotes the idiom, less familiarly, from Latin and Modern High German (Luther and Goethe); cf. also Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, ii, § 119, note 17. Altogether the idiom is found in Vedic and in Sanskrit; in Greek; in classical and in Late Latin; in Spanish, Provençal, and French; in Middle and Modern High German. See in general Böckh, *Encyklopädie und Methodologie der philologischen Wissenschaften* (1877), p. 105; Meyer-Lübke, *Grammaire des Langues Romaines*, vol. ii, § 75; iii, § 209; Diez, iii, p. 84; Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge*, iii<sup>1</sup>, p. 72; Hanssen, *Spanische Grammatik* § 56. 2; Gessner, *Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, xix. 155; Appel's *Old-Provençal Chrestomathie*, St. 16, vv. 29-32.

<sup>1</sup> More fully: 'Both plebs and patricians have come; my father-in-law alone has not come.'

<sup>2</sup> The use of *viçvaḥ*, singular, as a collective in the sense of 'plebs', approximates the word to the plural *viçve*, in the same sense. This perhaps accounts for the seemingly senseless substitution in TS. i. 2. 2. 1, of the plural *viçve* for the singular *viçvaḥ* with a singular verb (as in the other versions): *viçve devásya netúr mártō vṛṇīta sakhyám*, 'the plebs, the mortal shall choose the companionship of the god that leadeth'. See last Keith, *Veda of the Black Yajus*, HOS. vol. xviii, p. 21.



#### 4. On the expression *návyam sányase*.

The expression *návyam sányase* occurs, as far as I know, three times in the RV.<sup>1</sup> and once in the Mahānāmni-verses of the SV. and Āitareya-āranyaka, which makes it easy to take account.

The Pet. Lexs. and Grassmann in his Lexicon translate *sányas* by 'old', 'older', without indicating in any way how the word is to be rendered in its connection. Geldner in his Glossary renders the entire expression *návyam sányase* by 'was dem ältesten neu ist, d. h. etwas ganz neues, noch nie dagewesenes'. Keith, in his Translation of Āitareya-āranyaka, p. 263, suggests for *návyam* the meaning 'praiseworthy' (from root *nu*). As regards translations it will be well to review the proposals for each passage. RV. 3. 31. 19 reads:

*tām aṅgirasván námasā saparyán  
návyam kṛṇomi sányase purājām.*

Grassmann, vol. I, p. 530: 'Mit Anbetung ihn nach Aṅgiras-art verehrend, mach ich das alterzeugte [Lied] neu dem alten (sc. god Indra)'. Ludwig, 498: 'wie Aṅgiras mit Anbetung ihm dienend, mach ich ihn neu zum gewinnen, den ehvordem entstandenen'. Ludwig does not comment upon his rendering: obviously he regards *sányase* as an infinitive of root *san* 'obtain'. Oldenberg, Nachrichten der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1915, p. 381: 'ich mache durch meine Anbetung den alten Gott neu (*návyam*) für alte Tat (damit du diese auch jetzt wieder tun mögest)'. It is easy to show that Grassmann was pretty close to the truth, tho he did not quite get it, and lapsed, as we shall see, in the two other RV. passages: *návyam kṛṇomi sányase purājām* contains, to my mind, a playful paradox: 'I make a new song (*bráhma*) that is (in reality) primordial (*purājām*) for the good old (*sányase*) god'.

The passages which show this to be true are of an almost mathematical insistence. RV. I. 62. 13: *sanāyaté gótama indra návyam átaṣad bráhma hariyójanāya*, 'Gotama has fashioned for thee, O Indra, the old god, a new song, in order that thou mayest hitch thy bay steeds'. This paraphrases *sányase* by

sanāyaté, and fixes upon návyam the noun bráhma, and from this, as will appear, there is not a hair's breadth of deviation. See next 10. 91. 13, imám prasnāya suṣṭutīm náviyasīm vóceyam asmā ucaté, 'let me pronounce for the god of yore, that is willing, this quite new song'. Here prasnāya suṣṭutīm náviyasīm = návyam (bráhma) sányase. Next, 6. 62. 5, tá valgú dasrá puruṣákataṁ prasnā návyasā vácasā vivāse, 'these two lovely, most powerful Dasras (Açvins) of old I invite with a quite new song'. Here prasnā návyasā vácasā = návyam (bráhma) sányase. RV. 6. 22. 7: tám (sc. índram) vo dhiyā návyasyā çaviṣṭham prasnām prasnávāt paritaṁsaya-dhyāi, 'deck out that mighty (Indra) of old with a new hymn as of old'. Here dhiyā návyasyā prātnam = návyam (bráhma) sányase. In 1. 61. 2 the antithesis between the 'new song' and the 'old god' is implied almost as clearly as tho it were directly expressed: asmāi . . . índrāya . . . prasnāya pātye dhīyo marjayanta, 'let them polish up their songs for Indra the lord of old'. The word marjayanta 'polish up' here well takes the place of 'new'. The word prātna is a favorite in such connection, as may be seen in such passages as 6. 39. 5; 10. 4. 1.

In a slightly more remote way the antithesis between the 'new song' and the 'old god' is in the mind of the author of 2. 17. 1: tát asmāi návyam aṅgirasvād arcata çuṣmā yád asya prasnāthodīrate, 'this new (bráhma) sing ye for him (Indra) in the fashion of the Aṅgiras in order that his fire shall be aroused as of old' (note aṅgirasvād, implying the past, as well as prasnāthā). Here návyam (bráhma) prasnāthā aṅgirasvāt = návyam (bráhma) sányase. Yet more round about, 8. 95. 5: índra yás te náviyasīm gíraṁ mandrām ájījanat . . . dhīyam prasnām. And 9. 9. 8: nú návyase náviyase sūktāya sādhayā pathāḥ, prasnávād rocayā rúcaḥ.

It is clear now that the expression návyam (bráhma) sán-yase (devāya) is elliptic. The reason why we Westerners are slow to understand such an expression is, that the Vedic Hindus understood it too well. The underlying idea, as the passages just cited show, must have become immensely familiar, before they could express it by simply saying 'a new for an old'. The same almost kenning-like familiarity of the expression guarantees beforehand that it could not have been

used in any other sense than just that. With this reasoning the facts chime in perfectly. RV. 8. 67. 18 reads:

tát sú no návyam sányasa ádityā yán mūmocati,  
bandhād baddhām ivādite.<sup>1</sup>

Grassmann, who came nearest to understanding 3. 31. 19, lapses from grace utterly: 'Zum alten fügt dies neue ihr, Aditya's, was, O Aditi, uns löst wie Sklaven von dem Strick'. Ludwig, 126: 'disz neue sei uns zum gewinne, was erlöset, o Āditya, wie aus fesseln den gebundenen, o Aditi'. Bergaigne, iii. 161, omitting apparently sányase: 'voici notre nouvel (hymne) qui doit nous délivrer, ô Adityas, comme un homme lié de son lieu, ô Aditi'. Oldenberg, l. c.: 'diese neue Tat (wird) uns (zuteil) zum Zweck des alten—d. h. damit die alte Tat fortwirke, sich erneuere.' Translate: 'This, pray, is our new (song) for a right old (god), which, O Ādityas, shall free us as a captive from his chain, O Aditi'.

The third occurrence of this cliché is in RV. 8. 24. 26:

tám u tvā nūnām īmahe návyam daṁsiṣṭha sányase,  
sá tvām no viçvā abhimātiḥ sakṣāṇiḥ.

Grassmann: 'Darum begehren wir von dir zum alten neues, herrlicher, sei du Vertilger aller Widersacher uns'. Ludwig, 597, 'als solchen flehen wir dich jetzt an, den frischen, wundertätigster, zu gewinne, als solcher bist du es, der uns alle nachstellungen überwindet'. Oldenberg, l. c.: 'wir gehen dich den Neuen (d. h. erneut sich Betätigenden) an für die alte Tat (damit du diese auch jetzt wieder tun mögest)'. In this stanza the construction of īmahe with two accusatives, rather than with accusative and instrumental is unusual: 'We pray to thee now, O most wise (Indra), a new (song) for a right old god: thou art the conqueror of all that plot against us'. Cf. pratnābhir ūtibhis by the side of īmahe in 8. 12. 24; or yajñēṣu pūrvyām by the side of īmahe in 8. 60. 2. Perhaps pāda b is to be taken parenthetically: 'We implore thee now—a new song for a right old god'—etc. There is, in any case, not the faintest reason for taking návyam sányase in a different sense.

<sup>1</sup> The stanza is paralleled interestingly in 8. 18. 12: tát sú naḥ çarma yachatādityā yán mūmocati, énasvantam cid énaṣaḥ sudānavaḥ.

The formula crops out once more in a passage of the Ma-hānāmī litany :

nūnām tán návyam sányase  
prábho jánasya vṛtrahan.<sup>1</sup>

Oldenberg, l. c., '(ist) diese (Tat) nunmehr neu für die alte' (d. h. zum Zwecke der Erneuerung der alten). Or, '(rufen wir) diesen neuen jetzt (an) für die alte Tat' (d. h. damit er seine alte Tat wiederhole). Translate: '(We sing) now this new (song) in honor of the right old (god), O thou that art distinguished among the people, O slayer of Vṛtra'! That the poets diligently describe Indra as 'the god of yore' follows from the preceding passages, and can be easily corroborated by further evidence which is in everybody's hands.

**5. On stanza 6 in the hymn of Saramā and the Panis,  
RV. 10. 108.**

Both the meaning of some of the words and a certain uncouth quality of the construction, which obviously states paratactically what, to our feeling, should be stated hypotactically, have kept this stanza a crux interpretum. There is scarcely a Vedic scholar who has not in one way or another tried his hand at it. The following is an endeavor once more to clear its difficulties. The stanza reads :

asenyā vaḥ paṇayo vácānsy aṇṣavyās tanvāḥ santu pāpīḥ,  
ádhrṣto va étavā astu pánthā bṛhaspátir va ubhayā ná mṛlāt.

Ludwig (992): 'Nicht von waffenart (wenigstens) sind eure reden; gesetzt es wären dem pfeil nicht ausgesetzt eure schlechten leiber, unbewältigt der weg zu euch zu kommen, Bṛhaspati wird euch in keinem falle (ob es ist oder nicht ist) gnädig sein'.<sup>2</sup>

Grassmann: 'Nicht treffend sind, o Paṇi's eure Worte; und wären schussfest eure bösen Leiber, und undurchdringlich auch der Weg zu euch hin, Bṛhaspati wird beides nicht verschonen'.

Geldner und Kaegi, Siebenzig Lieder, p. 79: 'Mit Worten, Paṇi, könnet ihr nicht fechten; und wären schussfest eure

<sup>1</sup> For the text see Oldenberg, l. c., pp. 377, 381.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. his comment with other suggestions.

schlechten Leiber, der Weg zu euch auch noch so schwer zu zwingen, das alles wird Br̥haspati nicht kümmern'.

Von Schroeder, *Mysterium und Mimus*, p. 175: 'Nicht Wunden schlagen, Paṇis, eure Worte! Und wären schussfest eure schlechten Leiber, wär auch der Weg zu euch schier unbezwinglich, Br̥haspati wird beides nicht verschonen'.

Hertel, *WZKM.* xviii. 60: 'Mit Worten, Paṇi, könnt ihr nicht versehren; wenn schussfest eure sünd'gen Leiber wären, und unzugänglich alle eure Pfade: Br̥haspati versagt euch seine Gnade'.

Hillebrandt, *Lieder des Rig-Veda*, p. 147: 'Wehrlos sind eure Worte, Paṇis. Eure Leiber, die hässlichen, mögen undurchdringlich für die Pfeile, der Weg zu euch mag unnahbar sein: Br̥haspati wird euch in keinem Falle gnädig sein'.

The most critical word in the stanza is ubhayā. Those translators who take the word in the sense of 'beides' are obviously in error; the accent shows that it is adverbial (ubhayā from stem ubhāya) meaning 'in either case', 'whether so or so'. Thus Ludwig in his translation; Bartholomae, *IF.* v. 227, note 3; Oldenberg, *RV.* Noten to the passage.<sup>1</sup> The stanza thus contains an alternative between two suppositions; the question is where to place the hinge or seam between the alternatives. In this we must be guided by santu and astu which harbor the idea 'whether it be so or so'. Now it is clear that santu controls pādas ab; astu pāda c; the conclusion comes in pāda d. We may expect something favorable and something unfavorable to the Paṇis: 'in either case Br̥haspati shall not spare you' (pāda d).

The entire first couplet contains the something unfavorable to the Paṇis. Here, namely in the word aniṣavyāś, may be found the solution of the difficulties of the stanza. The stem aniṣavyā is rendered in the translations above by 'impervious to arrows'. So also, unanimously as far as I know, the lexicons (*Pet. Lexs.*; Grassmann; Monier Williams; Bergaigne, *Études sur le Lexique du Rig-Veda*; Hillebrandt, *Vedachrestomathie*, etc.).<sup>2</sup> The word means nearly the very opposite of that, for it contains iṣavya with the negative

<sup>1</sup> On the grammatical aspect of ubhayā see last Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, ii. 1, p. 21.

<sup>2</sup> Myself in the same error, *ZDMG.* xlviii. 549, note 3.

prefix. Now *iṣavya* means 'war-like' literally, conversant with 'arrows': *ā rāṣṭre rājanyaḥ ṣūra iṣavyo* (VS. ÇB. add 'tivyādhi) *jāyatām* VS. 22. 22; MS. 3. 12. 6: 162. 7; ÇB. 13. 1. 9. 2; *āsmiṇ rāṣṭre rājanya iṣavyaḥ ṣūro mahāratho jāyatām* TS. 7. 5. 18. 1; KSA. 5. 14; TB. 3. 8. 13. 1 (cf. ÇÇ. 8. 18. 1; JUB. 1. 4. 2). The passages speak for themselves: *iṣavya* is the same as *iṣu-bala* (by the side of *citrā-sena*; cf. *asenyā* in our stanza<sup>1</sup>), RV. 6. 75. 9; or the *iṣumān vīro āstā*, RV. 2. 42. 2.<sup>2</sup> Therefore *aniṣavya* means, 'unwarlike', lit., 'not inured to arrows'. And by the same terms *asenyā* means 'not inured to missiles', i. e., again, synonymically, 'unwarlike'. The conception *indraḥ sényaḥ*, 1. 81. 2; 7. 30. 2, hovers before the mind of the writer as the opposite of *asenyā*.

It can be seen now what the stanza means: 'Whether (on the one hand), O Paṇis, your words be feeble, your vile bodies cowardly; or whether (on the other hand) the road to you be hard to dare, in either case Bṛhaspati (Indra's Purohita) will show you no mercy'.

While on the theme of 10. 108, I would remark that stanzas 9 and 10 have always seemed to me post festum and anti-climax. These two stanzas fit better after stanza 2, where they would in no sense disturb the sequel of the hymn. Or, they may be imagined as standing in the same position in the place of 3 and 4, of which they would be a not bad alternate version. Cf. 3<sup>rd</sup>, *mitrām enā dadhāmātha gāvāṃ gópatir no bhavāti*, with 9<sup>th</sup>, *svāsāraṃ tvā kṛṇavāi mā púnar gā āpa te gāvāṃ subhage bhajāma*; and again cf. 4<sup>th</sup>, *nāhām tām veda dābhyam dābhat sá*, with 10<sup>th</sup>, *nāhām veda bhrātṛtvām nó svasṛtvām*. I have a sort of Vāḷakhilya feeling as regards the two pairs. If this be so I need scarcely point out that stanza 11, in close catenation with 10, was composed after 9 and 10 got their place where they now stand in the hymn.

## 6. On the meaning of *ukhachid*.

Windisch, Festgruss an Otto von Böhtlingk, p. 115, has made it clear that this compound means 'lame', being a periphrasis—we might say a sort of kenning—of *croṇā*. The

<sup>1</sup> For *senā* in the sense of 'missile' see last Bloomfield, ZDMG. xlviii. 549, note 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also, more remotely the type of passage such as 3. 4. 9=7. 2. 9. where *sudákṣa* seems to occupy the place of *iṣavyā* or *iṣumān*.

word is ἀπ. λεγ. in RV. 4. 19. 9, *nir bhūd ukhachīt sām aranta pārva*, 'the lame man was off; his joints fitted together'. Cf. the convincing parallel in 8. 79. 2, *nīḥ ṣronó bhūt*, 'the lame man was off'. Now he finds the word *ukhā* in certain grammatical word-lists (*gaṇas*) among words for parts of the body, and one commentator explains it by *sphik*, 'hip'. There is nothing to prevent *ukhā* from having that meaning in a figurative way, though it is, as far as I know, not quotable in that sense in Hindu literature. Windisch next assumes that *ukhachīd* means 'one who has broken his hip' ('*der einen hüftenbruch erlitten hat*'), therefore, 'lame'.

We should expect *ukhachinna* rather than *ukhachīd*, 'hip-breaker', which would seem to state something habitual, whereas the lame man would break his hip only a single time. The analogy is with compounds like *grīvachinna* 'one whose neck is cut', *Suparṇākh*. 25. 6; *grīvābhagna*, with the same meaning, *Vetālap*. 17. 6; *grīvabaddha*, 'bound by the neck' *TS*. 3. 3. 8. 3, *jānvakna* (comm. *sambhugnajānu*), 'with bent knee', *ApÇ*. 10. 9. 2. Moreover there is that in the literature which leads me to suspect that *ukhā* in *ukhachīd*<sup>1</sup> has its primary meaning of 'pot' or 'pan'. Thus *ÇB*. 6. 6. 4. 8: *yady eṣokhā bhidyeta*, 'now if this pot breaks'; *TS*. 5. 1. 9. 2: *sā* (sc. *ukhā*) *yad bhidyetārtim ārchad yajamāno hanyetāsya yajñah*, 'if this (pot) be broken, the sacrificer gets into trouble, his sacrifice is destroyed'; *ApÇ*. 10, 5, 3: *mitrāitām ta ukhām paridadāmy abhityā eṣā mā bhedī*, 'O Mitra, I make over to thee this pot unto unbreakableness; it shall not be broken'. Breaking of the pot (*ukhābhedanam*) is provided for ritualistically in *KÇ*. 16. 7. 8. The *ukhā* was fragile, being made of clay (*mṛṇmayī*) which was baked (*çrāpaya*), *VS*. 11. 59, et al. The *ukhā* leaks easily: *mā susroḥ* 'do not leak', *AV*. 12. 3. 12; *ukhām sravan-tīm* 'the leaking pot', *KÇ*. 25. 9. 14; *MÇ*. 3. 5. 14. It has to be placed firmly on the altar to keep it secure: *ukhā kumbhī vedyām mā vyathiṣṭhāḥ*, 'do not, pot or kettle, wobble on the altar', *AV*. 12. 3. 23 (cf. *MS*. 4. 1. 3: 4. 9; *TB*. 3. 2. 3. 1). In case it broke a new one had to be made, *Vāit*. 28. 12.

It would seem then that the fragile *ukhā* was found to be less secure in the hands of a lame man, who might thus be nick-named 'pot-breaker'. It is not necessary to inquire how

<sup>1</sup> The short a is rhythmical; see Leumann, *Gurupūjākāumudī*, p. 13.

much fancy and how much fact there was at the bottom of the notion. Persons with bodily defects are apt to be nicknamed all over the world; another Skt. designation of a lame man, *ekapad*, 'One-leg', shows the same spirit.

### 7. Irregular Relative Clause Constructions.

The poet *Agastya*, in *RV.* i. 176, seems to me to have difficulty in handling a relative with its antecedent pronoun, stem *ta-*, or, perhaps some metrical consideration led him to unusual passes in this same matter. Stanza 5 reads:

āvo yāsya dvibārhaso 'rkēṣu sānuśág ását,  
ājāv índrasyendo právo vājeṣu vājīnam.

Previous treatments are listed by Oldenberg, *Rig-Veda Noten*, i. 176. It seems to me well, in the first place, to comment upon Geldner's ingenious translation, *Ved. Stud.* ii. 129: 'Wen du, O Soma, bei einem Wettkampfe zu Ehren des doppelstarken Indra schütztest, der wird in den Liedern ordentlich sein; du beschütztest den im Kampfe siegreichen'. The formal difficulty in this rendering is the accent of *ásat*, which disqualifies it from service in the principal clause of the sentence, but points to the subordinate clause.

As regards the sense, I do not believe that there is any indication of a race ('wettkampf') in honor of Indra (if so, where?). When a Vedic text says *ājāv índrasya*, it can, in my opinion, have in mind but one thing, namely, 'in the contest for Indra', that is to say, in the attempt to secure the presence of the 'much-called' god (*puruhūtá*, and the like); see, e. g., 6. 19. 3<sup>d</sup>, *asmāñ indrābhy ā vavṛtsvājāu*. Moreover, Geldner's translation, as a whole, carries with it an obvious hysteron proteron which is suspiciously parallel to the wrong accent of *ásat*. We should expect the poet to say that Soma inspires him that composes skilful poems to secure Indra's presence, rather than that he whom Indra protects is skilful in poetry. The latter might be an idea applicable later to the court of a Bhoja Rāja; it is not a Vedic idea.

Oldenberg's suggestions are advanced hesitatingly, especially as regards *sānuśák* which, he thinks, may be a compound = *sa-ānuśák*, or = *sānu-śák*. Tho the *Padapāṭha* does not analyze *sānuśák*, and tho it has but one accent, I believe with others, that we must read *sānuśák* = *sa + ānuśák*.



The passage seems to state: 'Thou didst aid him who is clever (ānuśák) in songs in honor of twice-strong (Indra); didst, O Indu (Soma), aid him in the contest for Indra (the much-called). Thou didst aid in obtaining substance him that hath substance'. For arkéṣu ānuśák cf., e. g., 5. 8. 10, gīrbhír yajñébhír ānuśák. In the first distich of our stanza the logical antecedent tám, 'him', seems to be incorporated in the relative clause as sá in sānuśák. This accounts for the obscuration of \*sānuśák, and the consequent loss of one of its accents. Moreover yásya seems to be for yó asya, or for single yó attracted to the case of dvibárhasaḥ.<sup>1</sup> Here is what the passage seems to say in good Vedic: ávo tám yó (or yó asya) dvibárhaso' rkéṣv ānuśág ásat (thus the accent of ásat is justified); áva ājāv índrasyendo; právo vájeṣu vājinam. The fourth pāda, repeated in 1. 4. 8, looks a little like an appendage, and may have been borrowed from that stanza.

The same Agastya in the same hymn, 1. 176. 2, seems once more to have assimilated a relative pronoun (attraction) to another word in the same relative clause:

tásminn á veçayā gíro yá ékaç carṣaṇīnām,  
ánu svadhā yám upyáte yávaṁ na cárkrṣad vṛṣā.

See Oldenberg, *Rig-Veda Noten*, and the literature there cited; and cf. Colinet, *Sur le sens du mot svadhā*, p. 14. Two points seem to me to control the explanation of this curious passage. First, the words ánu svadhā belong together = ánu svadhāḥ<sup>2</sup>; this eliminates the need of combining ánu and vap, a combination otherwise unknown in the RV. This on the evidence of 9. 103. 5; 10. 37. 5 (ánu svadhāḥ); 1. 33. 11; 88. 6; 3. 51. 11; 4. 33. 6; 52. 6; 7. 56. 13; 8. 88. 5 (ánu svadhām); and anuṣvadhām, frequent adverb. All mean, 'according to habit or custom'. Should this be so, then, secondly, yám in pāda c cannot be construed, unless we regard it as attracted

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Neisser, *ZDMG*. lxi. 138, and Oldenberg's note, *Rig-Veda Noten*, i, to 4. 21. 1 for similar phenomena regarding the relative. Cf. also the same author, *Rig-Veda Noten*, ii, p. 379b (*Relativsatz frei angeschlossen*).

<sup>2</sup> Thus, previously, Bergaigne, iii. 9, note. The *Padapāṭha*, of course, in not explaining svadhā as svadhāḥ, must have interpreted the word as nominative, subject of upyáte with ánu. All attempts to interpret on this basis strike me as forced and unbelievable.

from the nominative (yás) to the accusative yávam in its own relative clause.

Under this construction, the stanza, addressed to Soma would run as follows: 'Make enter into him (sc. Indra), who is sole (ruler) of the peoples, our songs, as a bull ploughs (i. e. makes enter) grain (into the field), grain which is sown according to (established) custom!' That is to say, omitting the attributive pāda b,<sup>1</sup> the stanza is equivalent to the following: *tásminn ā veçayā gíro yávam ná cārkrṣad vṛṣā, ánu svadhā yá* (sc. *yávaḥ*) *upyáte*. The sense then were clear: the poet asks Soma to enter Indra (I. 176. 1; 9. 2. 1), and, as he enters, to carry with him the poet's songs, in order to ensure Indra's gratitude to the poet. He must do this as regularly or steadily as the plough-steer, according to established custom, ploughs grain into the soil. That the expression, *yávam na cārkrṣad vṛṣā*, does not require any further description, such as is contained in the fictitious *ánu upyáte*, 'pouring the grain in after the plough has ploughed', may be gathered from the repetition of the idea in I. 23. 15, *góbhir yávam ná cārkrṣat*.

In our interpretation of I. 176. 2<sup>c</sup> much weight is given to the habitual adverbial expressions in which various forms of *svadhā* are governed by *ánu*. I should be loath to see this argument exercise undue influence. In one RV. passage, 5. 34. 1, juxtaposition of *ánu* and *svadhā* is entirely fortuitous: *ánu* does not govern *svadhā*, but belongs to *īyate*:

*ājātaçatrum ajārā svārvaty ánu svadhāmitā dasmám īyate,  
sunótana pácata bráhmavāhase puruṣtutāya pratarám da-  
dhātana.*

Roth in *Pet. Lex.* s. v. I. *svadhā* 3) was under the influence of those adverbial expressions when he suggested the reading *ánu svadhām ámitā* in this stanza, but *svadhā* (nominative) is here personified: 'Svadhā unaging, full of light, unmeasured follows the wise god (Indra) whose enemy is yet to be born'; see in AV. 2. 29. 7, the *ūrjā svadhā ajārā*, created by Indra; and the *svadhā ajārā* of the Fathers in 12. 2. 32.

<sup>1</sup> Repeated in much better connection in I. 7. 9. In our stanza the pāda is a dislocated fragment.

Once more, AV. 6. 53. 1<sup>c</sup>, ánu occurs before svadhā under rather trying circumstances: ánu svadhā cikitām sómo agniḥ. Whitney in his Translation observes that the compound verb ánu + ci does not occur elsewhere in the language but renders, 'let the svadhā favor [me; let] Soma, Agni'. Ludwig, *Der Rig-Veda*, vol. iii, p. 506 translates, 'durch die Svadhā denke daran Soma, Agni'. He seems to make ánu govern svadhā as a homophonous instrumental. I have thought of correcting to ánu svadhām (or svadhāḥ), and thus escaping the dubious combination ánu + ci; cf. AV. 6. 96. 3, sómas táni svadhāyā naḥ punātu; AV. 18. 3. 8, sám sómena mādasya sám svadhābhiḥ. But why should the text of 6. 53. 1 have slipped from the line of least resistance (ánu svadhām, or ánu svadhāḥ) into ánu svadhā?

An incorporated relative conversely attracts secondarily its subject in the clause which contains the attraction. RV. 10. 17. 9:

sārasvatīm yām pitāro hāvante dakṣiṇā yajñām abhinák-  
 śamāṇāḥ,  
 sahasrārghām iló átra bhāgām rāyās póṣaṁ yájamāneṣu  
 dhehi.

Here sārasvatīm is attracted from the vocative or nominative to the accusative yām: the attraction is quite as illogical as that of yasya for yāḥ in 1. 176. 5, or yām for yāḥ in 1. 176. 2.

Similarly in 1. 183. 1, táṁ yuñjāthām mánaso yó jávīyān trivandhuró vṛṣaṇā yás tricakráḥ, 'Yoke, O ye two bulls, that car which is swifter than the mind, has three pole-boards,<sup>1</sup> and three wheels'. Here trivandhuró . . . yás tricakráḥ (for trivandhurām, etc.) is attracted to the articular relative phrase mánaso yó jávīyān (formula in i. 117. 2; 118. 1; 10. 112. 2).

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

<sup>1</sup> For the meaning of vandhúra see my forthcoming work, *Rig-Veda Repetitions*, HOS., vol. xx, p. 236. The work comprises volumes xx and xxiv of Harvard Oriental Series.